

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

16 October 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Cooper

SUBJECT: Distribution Survey

1. In an earlier note to you I stated that we should decide, before we go any further, whether we want all the information resulting from this survey and what we think we are going to do with it when we get it. I met with OCR a couple of weeks ago and, as a result of that conference, in addition to my previous serious misgivings about the manner in which this inquiry was going, decided that we should suspend operations on Phase I (the door-to-door interrogation) until we could rethink the whole undertaking. To continue it on the present basis was merely to cause unnecessary irritations among our friends with few tangible results.

2. As a first step, I asked OCR to give me a picture of the distribution of NIE's by agencies for as many years as possible in order to determine if the premise on which we based our inquiry were correct and to spot, if possible, the points where the major increases had occurred. The attached rough tabular presentation, just received, is the result. This is the only copy. As constructed, it tends to distort the situation, particularly with respect to those agencies showing the smallest increase. However, it is adequate for our immediate purposes. On a percentage basis, the increases in five years have been 166% for internal CIA and Records

11 25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

*Am reduced 50% in  
press in 1960  
29*

Center and 65% for all other activities. The increases are broken down as follows:

	No. rec'd. '54	No. rec'd. '59	% increase '54-'59
CIA	41	111 <sup>119</sup>	171%
Records Center	36	94 <sup>116</sup>	161%
Army	27	65	141%
State	20	35 <sup>34</sup>	75%
Defense { JCS 25 Def.	22	35 <sup>37</sup>	59%
Air Force	26	40 <sup>113</sup>	54%
Navy	25	31 <sup>32</sup>	24%
NSC	18	19 ✓	5½%
Other	10	20	100%
TOTALS	225	450	

3. OCR will provide me with the internal CIA list for the past five years and I shall seek other detailed data as needed. Although I have some tentative ideas on how we should salvage this ill-fated operation, I believe it best to pursue the present line of inquiry a little further before expounding them.

4. My investigation has turned up one rather embarrassing by-product, the existence of which has apparently passed unnoticed for some five or six years. My revised questionnaire was predicated on the assumption that the addressees' (or recipients') names appear

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(as they used to) in addressograph form on the covers of the NIE's. The dissemination notice on the inside cover of the NIE's, in paragraph 1, indicates that "this copy is for the information and use of the recipient indicated on the front cover, etc." I asked OCR to look into this and, upon investigation, they report that this practice of stamping the recipient's name or title on the front cover was discontinued more than five years ago. *(They were apparently unaware of this)* At my request they are trying to find out why this was done and under whose instructions. I do not propose that we take any precipitate action regarding this. <sup>After</sup> five years, we can afford to wait until all the facts are in. However, it is pertinent to our present inquiry since any final decision regarding the control of NIE dissemination is likely to affect the wording of the Dissemination Notice. In any case, even if no actual change in control is made, we will want either to continue with paragraph 1 and have the recipients' names imprinted or to revise paragraph 1 to conform to present practice. When my information is complete, I will advise you further.

5. With reference to what I call Phase II of the survey (the questionnaire enclosed in the NIE's), the results to date are not very encouraging. As of 7 October, scattered returns from the various agencies added up to the following:

NIE 11-6-59	NIE 70-59	NIE 12-59	NIE 27.2-59
34	38	44	71

CONFIDENTIAL

Since about 350 of each of these estimates were distributed, this is obviously a pitifully poor return. Unless there is a much larger response, we will certainly not have a sufficiently representative across-the-board sample on which to base any conclusions. Although my personal reaction is that the results of this exercise will not be very meaningful in any case, I have not felt that I should stop it in midstream. However, I do believe that we should take some positive action, perhaps in the form of a memo to our most important customers, asking their cooperation.



25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

UNCLASSIFIED				CONFIDENTIAL				SECRET			
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP											
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS						INITIALS		DATE		
1	Mr. Casper										
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
ACTION			DIRECT REPLY			PREPARE REPLY					
APPROVAL			DISPATCH			RECOMMENDATION					
✓ COMMENT			FILE			✓ RETURN					
CONCURRENCE			✓ INFORMATION			SIGNATURE					

Remarks: A progress report to keep you abreast of the situation.  
Action as Phase II is proposed in para. 5  
Attachments enclosed to Carol 7/29/60

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER	
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE